



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The tariff system is too firmly fixed to be abolished simply to build up shipping, and on the whole that system seems to have practically demonstrated its soundness in view of commercial conditions in this country.

Having assumed this point of view, the writer reviews our shipping history and concludes that the policy of monopoly to American vessels in the coastwise trade was "a wise one in view of our present protective tariff policy as to other industries," and the adoption of full reciprocity in the direct and indirect foreign trades was an error, though "it by no means follows it would be wise to endeavor to restore that policy at the present time." The present status of American shipping is then examined and the various remedies that have been suggested as applicable to the foreign-trade situation are discussed. The policy finally recommended is a fourfold policy and embraces (1) free ships in foreign trade; (2) free building materials; (3) intelligent application of the policy of granting liberal contracts for carrying the mails, and (4) discriminating duties in indirect trade. To employ this last effectively "would require that the free list be abolished so far as goods carried by foreign carriers in the indirect trade are concerned." This policy he regards as "satisfactory from the point of view of all parties interested," as it would be liberal to the ship-builder, fair to sailors, and helpful to the American ship-owner.

To speak in general terms, the discussion is largely a summary of arguments upon the question at issue—a summary which is convenient because of arrangement, (this is marred by typographical errors in part III), and because of an analytical table of contents. The range of materials consulted is not as wide as one would wish and the book must be characterized as "useful" but by no means as "final"—possibly not even as "authoritative."

It is number five of the Hart, Shaffner, and Marx prize essay series.

L. C. MARSHALL

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Labor Legislation of Connecticut. By ALBA M. EDWARDS. Publications of the American Economic Assn., Third Series, Vol. VIII, No. 3. New York: Macmillan Co., 1907. Pp. viii+322.

The purpose of this work is, "to discuss the labor legislation of Connecticut historically and critically, and so far as possible, to

trace the economic effects of these laws." Dr. Edwards traces this legislation from its inception in a weak attempt to restrict child labor in 1842 down to the present time. He finds that the legislation, in general, shows two main lines of development—the laws themselves have been made increasingly inclusive and detailed, and the provisions for their enforcement have been considerably strengthened. Due to the rapid development of the manufacturing industries within the state during the past forty years the Connecticut legislature has found it expedient to pass special laws governing not only the conditions of child and woman labor, but also such matters as the employment contract, employers' liability, the payment of wages, boycotting, blacklisting, arbitration of trade disputes, free public employment bureaus, convict labor, and an extensive series of factory acts regarding the ventilation and sanitation of factories, and the guarding of dangerous machinery.

This legislation has not been secured, however, without constant agitation and political pressure on the part of the workers themselves. In 1885-88, when many of the existing labor laws were enacted, some thirty or more members of the state legislature belonged to the Knights of Labor. Since that time most of the additional labor legislation has been secured through the efforts of the legislative committee of the Connecticut Branch of the American Federation of Labor. Dr. Edwards is led to state, therefore, that,

Since 1885, organized labor has been the chief factor in securing labor legislation, either by direct legislative campaigns, or by agitation outside the legislature, or by both.

Speaking of the results of this legislation, Dr. Edwards says:

The early laws usually were not enforced and their results were small. The same is true of some of the later laws. Many of the later labor laws were passed after the movement for a change had begun, and their influence on that movement cannot be determined. In other cases, as in the child-labor and weekly-payment laws of 1886, the factory-inspection laws of 1887 and later years, and the bakeshop law of 1897, the good effects of the laws stand out clearly. On the whole, the laws have been of great benefit to the laboring-classes and have improved very materially their condition and the conditions under which they work.

Dr. Edward's study of Connecticut labor legislation may be placed side by side with Miss Whittlesey's work on the labor legislation of Massachusetts, as a careful investigation into the actual

nature and workings of a state system of labor legislation. The information is valuable, and generally it is presented in a plain, straightforward manner, though at times the main points are somewhat obscured by a mass of historical detail.

It has been well said that in one respect, at least, we have an advantage over most countries of Europe, as regards labor legislation. We have forty-six states, each of which may initiate such legislation on its own accord without waiting for the consent of the others. Thus the more progressive parts of the country are not necessarily held back by the unprogressive districts. At the same time all the states, even the most backward, may profit from the experience of the others. Therefore, if this experience is carefully utilized with due regard to the different conditions of different sections of the country, serious dangers may be avoided and many advantages obtained. The value of such works as those of Dr. Edwards and Miss Whittlesey lies chiefly in the fact that they place at our disposal the lessons to be learned from the experience of the various individual states. It is quite clear from Dr. Edward's study, for example—and in this he confirms the conclusions arrived at by Miss Whittlesey in a similar study—that we are quite likely to pass excellent labor legislation without providing adequate means for its enforcement. In some respects such legislation is worse than useless, for it inculcates in its violators a contempt for the law. Again, in many cases it cannot be told just how a given law will operate until it is tried. In 1886, for example, the Knights of Labor advocated a bill which provided for the compulsory weekly payment of wages by all corporations. At that time Dr. A. T. Hadley was the Connecticut commissioner of labor. He recognized the evils attending the monthly payment of wages, but doubted very much whether a law requiring weekly payments would bring satisfactory results. The law was passed however, and within six years the percentage of all workers in both incorporated and unincorporated establishments who receive weekly payments rose from 38.4 per cent. to 81.58 per cent., showing that the law was very effective. The facts brought out in this study are of considerable value to the economist and the legislator. It is to be hoped that similar studies will be made of the labor legislation in the leading industrial states of the Union.

JOHN C. KENNEDY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO